



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 691/2024**

RAKESH PARMODRAI PARMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Kumar Singh, Mr. Vishal
Arun Mishra, Ms. Rupali Panwar, Mr.
Saurabh Sharma, Mr. Khushal
Aggarwal and Mr. Umang Mangal,
Advs.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aman Usman, APP for the State
with SI Amit Kumar, PS EOW.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA

ORDER

22.08.2024

%

1. An application under Section 439 with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C.') has been preferred on behalf of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 271/2019 under Sections 406/420/120B IPC registered at P.S.: Economic Offences Wing.

2. In brief, as per the case of prosecution, petitioner/accused, who is proprietor of M/s. Shree Gajanand Corporation (India) duped and lured several persons to work with him on pretext of earning Rs. 40,000-60,000/-. Petitioner convinced complainants to buy machines from him (for making pencil velvet covers) alongwith raw materials on false promise that it would yield high returns. It is pointed out that petitioner collected huge sum of money from complainants, by selling them machines and raw materials at high costs and when the complainants tried to sell the product to the



petitioner, he fled the country. The FIR is stated to have been registered in the year 2019 but accused could only be arrested in 2023 after opening of LOC though the same is disputed by learned counsel for petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that machines had been duly supplied to the customers/complainants but since the petitioner could not continue with the business, he had no other option but to close the same. He further submits that petitioner came to know about registration of FIR in the year 2022, after the family members of petitioner were contacted by the Police.

4. On the face of record, the petitioner having obtained sums from complainants after assuring high returns fled after supplying machines which were of little utility. Petitioner could only be arrested after LOC had been opened against him. Petitioner as such is a flight risk. Further, in case petitioner is released on bail, at this stage, it cannot be ruled out that witnesses may be influenced.

5. Considering the nature of offence wherein the innocent persons from humble background looking for employment and returns stand duped of their hard earned money, no grounds for bail are made out. Application is accordingly dismissed.

A copy of this order be forwarded to learned Trial Court for information.

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J

AUGUST 22, 2024/p